

DATIVE MARKING OF THE AFFECTEE ROLE: DATA FROM MODERN HEBREW

by

RUTH A. BERMAN

Tel Aviv University

ABSTRACT: The study concerns the ways in which dative marking by means of the preposition *le-* has been extended in colloquial Hebrew to a wide variety of syntactic contexts in which it did not occur at earlier stages of the language. These constructions include extraneous arguments in “ethical datives” such as *ha tinok šuv xala lanu* ‘the baby again got-sick to (= on) us’; avoidance of surface subjects with experiential predicates such as *acuv le rina* ‘is-sad to Rina’; and “extended datives” in three-place predicates such as *hu hoci la et ha nešama* ‘he took-out to (= from) her the heart’. These various occurrences of *le-* marking are shown to provide a unique means of encoding the semantic role of affectee in modern Hebrew, yielding a continuum of participant involvement which ranges from the highest degree of “reflexive datives” (e.g. *dan hitrocec lo ba rexov* ‘Dan ran to/for himself in-the street’) as extended from biblical usage, through to the most extraneous instance of ethical datives. In typological terms, the widespread use of *le-* in these superficially different functions is shown to correlate with the increasingly “dative orientation” of modern Hebrew compared both with earlier stages of the language and with a “non-dative oriented” language like modern English.

This study considers how dative marking by means of the preposition *le-* ‘to’ or ‘for’ has been extended in modern Hebrew to a wide range of syntactic contexts in which it did not occur at earlier stages of the language. We aim to show how, in many instances, use of *le-* marking provides speakers with a means of referring to some individual as affected by a given situation or event, and to thereby quite uniquely encode the case

*This is a revised version of a paper that appeared in *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, Volume 3, 1981. I am grateful to Mira Ariel, Ora Schwarzwald, and Yael Ziv for their comments on an earlier draft, and to David Gil, Gabriella Hermon, and Edward Keenan for helpful discussion of the issues raised in the paper.

role of affectee. Discussion here devolves mainly on the colloquial spoken variety of contemporary Hebrew, in which dative marking of the affectee role is particularly widespread. Such usage is quite generally attributed to Slavic-Yiddish influence (Even-Zohar, forthcoming), and is still considered non-normative by some (Sivan 1976).

The prefixal morpheme in question is also used to mark the infinitive form of verbs—e.g. *le-daber* 'to talk', *la-léxet* 'to walk'¹—as well as to denote movement towards—e.g. *rac le-xadro* 'ran to his-room' or *halax la-xanut* 'went to-the-store'. More germane to the present discussion is the fact that *le-* is used with the verb meaning 'be' as the basic way of expressing possession in Hebrew, as in many non-*habere* languages. Thus possessors are dative marked, as is the noun *dan* in *yeš le-dan kóva* 'be to-Dan (a) hat'='Dan has a hat' or the pronoun 'they' in *haya la-hem mazal* 'was to-them luck'='they had luck'.

Our analysis focuses on the kinds of constructions illustrated in the following two sets of examples:

- (1) *dan ne'elam li pit'om me ha ófek*
 Dan disappeared to-me suddenly from the horizon
 'Dan's gone and disappeared *on me* all of a sudden'
- (2) a. *dan_i ne'elam lo_j pit'om me ha ófek*
 Dan disappeared to-him suddenly from the horizon
- = b. *dan_i ne'elam mi-ménuj pit'om*
 Dan disappeared from-him suddenly
- ≠ c. *dan_i ne'elam lo_j pit'om me ha ófek*
 Dan disappeared to-him suddenly from the horizon
 'Dan's gone and taken it upon *himself* to disappear all of a sudden'

The first example above, as shown by the translation given for (1), indicates that the dative-marked first person is involved in, and feels affected by, a situation in which this person, the speaker, did not participate directly at all—Dan's disappearing. As such, sentence (1) closely corresponds to (2a), where someone other than Dan is affected by Dan's having disappeared. Furthermore, the ablative paraphrase of (2b) in the sense of

1. Broad phonetic transcription is adopted as a rough representation of Israeli Hebrew. Word stress is final unless indicated by an acute accent on the penultimate; and for ease of exposition, we represent as separate words morphemes that are orthographically part of the following word, such as *ha-* 'the', *le-* 'to', *ve-* 'and', or *še-* 'that'.

'from him' could be used to reword sentence (1) as well, to yield the synonymous *ne'elam mi-méni* 'disappeared *from* me' in place of *ne'elam li* 'disappeared *to*(=on) me'.² This paraphrase is not possible, however, in (2c), where the dative pronoun is coreferential with the subject noun *dan*, and a kind of reflexive sense is yielded, as suggested by the gloss for (2c).

Below we try to show that contemporary extensions of the dative nominal as in (1) and (2a) above can be given a uniform characterization under the common semantic concept of AFFECTEE of the event. We consider, firstly, uses of dative marking in sentences like (1) above, of the type termed "the ethical dative," in which the dative nominal represents an outsider or mere onlooker, a nonparticipant who is nonetheless perceived as affected by the event described (Section 1). We then try to show that dative marking provides an option to the use of canonic SV(O) constructions in one-place and two-place predicates, thereby serving to drain the subject of some of its syntactic and semantic functions in contemporary Hebrew (Section 2). We then consider how dative marking can be used in place of other types of oblique case markings in three-place predicates of the kind illustrated in (2a) above, where *le-* is used in place of an ablative marker, hence extending the notion of "indirect object" beyond recipients and benefactees (Section 3). The last kind of dative marking is of the kind illustrated in (2c) above, where the dative pronoun is coreferential with the subject NP. This "reflexive" type of dative is the only use attested to in classical, biblical Hebrew, and it is widely used in the modern literary language also. We shall try to show, however, that it has been considerably extended in colloquial usage today (Section 4). Finally, we suggest that these various uses of dative marking, as characterized in Sections 1 through 4, can be ranked along a cline of differing degrees of "affectee involvement," proceeding from the nonparticipant, onlooker type of affectee of the "ethical dative" through to the opposite extreme of the coreferential or reflexive dative nominal that may represent the only participant in a given event. We also consider more general implications of the data presented from modern Hebrew in terms of varying degrees of "dative orientation" across different languages and language types (Section 5).

2. In today's usage, preference for dative marking is so strong in some instances, that the periphrastic option tends to seem more marked, or to have a somewhat different, more restricted interpretation. Thus, the expression *ne'elam mi-* 'disappear from' is not common in colloquial usage in the literal sense of 'disappear from the sight of someone', as suggested in (2b) of the text. Rather, this is confined to the more literary expression meaning 'be hidden from X' in the sense of 'X is not aware of'.

1. "Ethical Datives"

The examples in (3) and (4) below illustrate a very special function of dative marking in current Hebrew— that of nonparticipating affectee.

- (3) a. rak še hi lo taxle li šuv axšav
 just that she not will-sicken to-me again now
 'Just so she doesn't go and get sick *on me* again now!'
- b. ha yéled tamid kam lanu mukdam davka be šabat
 the child always gets-up to-us early just on Saturday
 'The kid always wakes up early *on us* on the weekend (of all times)!'
- (4) a. ha kir ha ze alul li pol la-xem kol réga
 the wall the that might to fall to-you(pl) any moment
 'That wall's liable to fall *on you* (non-locative) any minute'
- b. cémax ka ze yigdal lax / lexa bli be'ayot
 plant like that will-grow to-you (fem/masc) without problems
 'That kind of plant will-grow without any difficulty *for you/for one*'

Such sentences are closely paralleled by constructions which are traditionally termed the "ethical" dative, as in the following examples in French (taken from Leclère, 1975):

- (5) a. je *te* bois dix pastis en trois minutes'
 'I can drink *you* ten Pernods in three minutes'
- b. Paul *m'a* encore enflé depuis deux jours
 'Paul went and swelled up *on me* again two days ago'

It is worth noting about such sentences, in Hebrew and French alike, that the dative-marked pronoun is syntactically, and logically, unnecessary: it is not in any way required by the verb. Pragmatically, too, the affectee of the event, the one marked by *le-*, is totally outside of the actual perpetration of the event, representing what Leclère (1975) characterizes as a kind of "onlooker" (*témoin*) to the event. Thus, in the examples in (3) above, the activity of getting sick or of waking up early is carried out quite independently of anyone other than the subject/agent. However, the speaker perceives himself as being the victim of this activity or circumstance, and he thus describes it as one by which he is affected. Similarly, in the examples in (4), the speaker addresses the hearer(s) as being directly affected by an event over which they themselves may have no control— such as the wall's falling down, or the way the plant grows.

On the other hand, the ethical dative is possible only if there is some intimate personal connection between the person(s) marked by the dative and the perpetrator or patient of the event. For instance, the comment in (3a) about someone getting sick "on the speaker" would hardly be appropriate if said by a doctor with reference to a patient whom he treats on a casual, occasional, or impersonal basis. This is true even when the *le*-marked pronoun does not refer to the speaker, as in the examples in (4) above; thus, the wall which might fall or the plant which will grow well must be such that the addressees of the utterance are closely involved with them, and hence are likely to be affected by anything which happens to it.³

Accordingly, the "ethical" kind of dative, which introduces a grammatically and pragmatically extraneous argument, a nonparticipant in the event's occurrence, is rather more restricted than the other types of dative marking considered below. Although it is not lexically restricted in the sense of being governed by a given class of verbs, it is limited to highly affective situations and types of discourse, where the speaker feels free to express his own or someone else's intimate connection with the perpetrator or patient of the event, and hence his own personal involvement in or attitude to that situation. Nonetheless, we chose the ethical dative as the starting-point for our analysis, for it seems to represent the prototypical instance of how classical dative marking has been extended in contemporary Hebrew, in that it so clearly highlights the point of view of the affectee of the situation, when subjectively perceived as such by the speaker.

2. Datives with One- or Two-Place Predicates: Experiencer vs. Agent

Modern Hebrew has a rather rich class of expressions like those in (6) below, where a predicate-initial construction takes a dative nominal—often in cases where a subject-requiring language like English would have an SV construction.

3. A generic reading is often yielded where the dative-marked nominal is second person, as in the Hebrew examples in (4) and the French in (5a) of the text, as well as below:

- (i) *hu mesugal li štot lexa et kol ha viski eclam ba msiba*
 he capable to drink to-you OM all the whiskey by-them at the party
 'He's capable of drinking all the Scotch at their party *on one*'

In such cases, the ethical dative is used in the sense of the whole universe of people involved in some way with the agent of the action.

- (6) a. *kar lo*
cold to-him —'he's cold'
b. *acuv le rina*
sad to Rina —'Rina is sad'
c. *haya la-xem ra po?*
was to-you bad here —'Did you feel bad/have a bad time here?'
d. *lo yihye lanu noax*
not will-be to-us comfy —'We won't feel comfortable/at ease'

This use of dative marking in what Bolinger (1973) calls "circumstantial predicates" is relatively limited in Hebrew compared with, for example, the Dravidian languages (Sridhar 1976), as well as many other languages which are rich in dative-marked experiential predicates of this kind. For instance, Hebrew uses a Subject \sim Predicate construction to express the equivalent of 'I'm hungry', or 'he was tired'; but dative marking of the experiencer is well-attested with numerous stative predicates in Hebrew, not only those in (6) above.⁴ The use of dative marking is also typical in predicate-initial constructions with sentential complements, like those in (7) below.

- (7) a. *kaše li le ehov oto*
hard to-me to like him
'It's hard for me to like him/I have a hard time liking him'
b. *xaval lanu še hu nixšal*
pity to-us that he failed
'It's a pity for us/We're sorry that he failed'
c. *haya xašuv le dan le hagi'a bazman*
was important to Dan to arrive on-time
'It was important for Dan/it mattered to Dan to get there on time'

In such constructions, the dative-marked nominal is optional, and where it does not occur, an impersonal, generic type of reading is yielded. However, if the experiencer of the predicate is overtly indicated, it invariably takes dative marking in these and in many other affective predicates which take sentential complements.

The predicate-initial constructions with dative-marked nominals like those in (6) and (7) above—e.g. 'is cold to me'='I'm cold', 'was a pity to

4. In fact, children sometimes extend datives to inappropriate contexts to yield, for instance, expressions like **ra'ev li* '(is) hungry to-me' in place of well-formed *ani ra'ev* 'I (am) hungry'. Moreover, semi-formulaic expressions such as *ko'ev li* 'hurts to-me'='I hurt', *kaše li* 'hard for me'='I can't do it', or *meša'amem li* 'is-boring to-me' in the sense of 'I'm bored' are very common among young preschool children (Berman, in press); and see in this connection, n. 5 below.

Dan that we lost' = 'Dan was sorry that we lost'—demonstrate, firstly, that Hebrew has a wide range of predicate-initial constructions and, secondly, that such predicates typically take a dative-marking argument to represent their experiencer. More germane to our central concern here are doublets like the following, where in each case the Predicate $\bar{\text{Dative}}$ construction in (a) has a Subject $\bar{\text{Predicate}}$ counterpart in (b).

- (8) (i) a. *avad le dan ha tik* = b. *dan ibed et ha tik*
 lost to Dan the file Dan lost OM the file
 'The file got lost on Dan'
- (ii) a. *lo yadú'a la-hem hexan hu* = b. *hem eynam yod'im*
 not known to-them where he (is) they don't know
 hexan hu
 where he (is)
- (9) (i) a. *lo mistader lanu im ha šita ha xadaša*
 not work-out to-us with the method the new
 'It isn't working out/arranging itself for us with the new method'
 = b. *anaxnu lo mistadr-im im ha šita ha xadaša*
 we('re) not managing+pl with the method the new
- (ii) a. *hitbalbel li nora ba bxina*
 got-mixed-up to-me awful in-the exam
 'Things got terribly mixed up for me in the exam'
 = b. *ani hitbalbal-ti nora ba bxina*
 I got-mixed-up awfully in-the exam

The examples in (8) above are in rather formal style, while those in (9) are in a very colloquial register. But they are structurally and semantically alike: the (a) sentences above have a predicate-initial construction with a dative-nominal, and in this they are like the "experiential datives" noted earlier in this section. However, here the (a) sentences quite generally have a regular SVO paraphrase, as shown in (b) above, where the preposition *et* marks the Direct Object nominal. The widespread use of the (a) Predicate $\bar{\text{Dative}}$ versions in preference to the (b) Subject $\bar{\text{Predicate}}$ options can be explained as a means of effectively downgrading the agent, hence taking attention away from any participant as perpetrator of a given action or event. In a different context (Berman 1979b), I noted that modern Hebrew has several syntactic devices for achieving different kinds of degrees of downgrading of the role of agent in a situation: by use of subjectless impersonals with 3rd person plural verbs; by use of middle-voice intransitives; through agentless passive constructions; and by straightforward topicalization by fronting of some element other than the subject NP. In the present context, I would like to suggest that use of the

dative marker *le-* also makes it possible to present an event as agentless, hence making it more impersonal. That is, the fact that speakers often choose to use a dative-marked nominal in place of a canonic two-place SVO construction has a special function: it serves to give the nominal that could function as surface subject the status of the experiencer of the event, the one affected thereby, rather than that of its perpetrator or agent; and thus it has the effect of absolving this experiencer of responsibility for the event, which he is presented as undergoing, rather than as performing.⁵

The glosses for these Predicate plus Dative constructions sound awkward in English, but they are very natural expressions in Hebrew, particularly in more everyday spoken usage, where an "affectee" point of view is perhaps more easily tolerated than in more "objective" discourse styles. As noted (notes 4 and 5), they are widespread in the speech of young children, and they also occur in numerous formulaic expressions, such as the following.

- (10) a. *nišbar lo* (me ha šob šelo)
 broke to-him (from his job)
 'He's fed up (with his job)'
 b. *nim'as lanu* (lixot kax)
 sickened to-us (to live so)
 'We've had it/We're sick of living like this'
 c. *mitxašek lahem* (la vo itanu)
 feels-like to-them (to come with us)
 'They feel like it/coming with us'

One effect of the use of such constructions is to lower the transitivity of the speaker's descriptions of the events in question (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson, 1980). Thus, the verb morphology in all the examples in (8) through (10), as well as those in n. 5 is typically INTRANSITIVE, often explicitly passive, so that the predicate markings correspond to a large extent to the *se* particle of French and its counterparts in other Romance languages, or the *-sja* suffix in Russian, as well as to the prefixes of Middle English verbs like *methink* or *become* in the sense of 'suit'. Furthermore, in close correspondence to the analysis suggested by Sridhar

5. Thus, children will report on events to those taking care of them by using constructions like the ones in (a), rather than take responsibility for the event, as in the (b) forms.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|------------------|---------|-----|-------|----------|
| (i) a. <i>nišbar li</i> | ha | séfel | b. <i>ani</i> | šavár-ti | et | ha | séfel | |
| broke | to-me | the | I | broke | OM | the | cup | |
| (ii) a. <i>nebdu</i> (sic) | lanu | ha | maftexot | b. <i>anáxnu</i> | ibád-nu | et | ha | maftexot |
| got-lost | to-us | the | keys | we | lost | OM | the | keys |

(11) a. *be tipšut-o, avad *le dan* ha tik
 in his-stupidity, got-lost to Dan the file
 b. be tipšut-o, *dan* ibed et ha tik
 in his-stupidity, Dan lost OM the file
 ‘Stupidly, Dan lost the file’

6. The dative experiencer does have certain subject-like behavioral properties, in controlling reflexivization and equi-NP deletion, as below:

- (i) nim'as *li* me *acmi*
sickened to-me from myself = 'I've gotten fed up with myself'
- (ii) kaše *lo* le histader im *acmo*
hard to-him to settle with himself = 'He has a hard time getting on with himself'

This accords with the claim made by Cole *et al.* (1980) that, across languages, where a given NP changes diachronically by becoming more subject-like, it will acquire behavioral properties of a subject BEFORE surface coding properties. However, other of the behavioral criteria applied in their study do not work with the dative NPs of Hebrew, which suggests that at this stage in its development at all events, the Hebrew dative is still basically nonsubject-like in character.

This suggests that possessive sentences can be viewed as one subset of the cases where use of a dative NP serves to weaken the concept of agency while encoding experientiality or, in this case, possession. It might be the case that languages like Hebrew or Russian, and certainly the Dravidian languages (Sridhar 1976), all of which indicate possession by dative marking on the possessor rather than by a Subject *habere* verb construction, might be more likely to use dative marking for the experiencer/affectee role in general. This seems to be true to some extent for French, where *avoir* in SV constructions coexists with *de/à* (dative) alternation in expressing possession. In the next type of construction we consider, we will see that dative marking interacts in other ways with the syntax/semantics of possession.

3. "Extended" Datives in Three-Place Predicates

The term "extended" datives is adapted from Leclère (1975), being used here to refer to the use of *le-* marked nominals in three-place predicate constructions which correspond structurally to the ordinary or canonic datives with verbs like those meaning *give, bring, send, tell, transfer, contribute*, etc. In the examples of canonic datives in (15) below, the ordering of the direct and indirect object respectively depends on considerations of heaviness as well as of relative knownness and focus of the two nonsubject NPs (for instance, pronouns typically come directly after the verb), and the *le-* marker must be retained, irrespective of the linear ordering of the constituents (see Berman 1982).

- (15) a. dan natan et ha matana *le* rina
 Dan gave OM the gift to Rina
 b. heváy-ti *la-hem* yerákot me ha šuk
 I brought to-them vegetables from the market

The examples in (16) below show that the same marker *le-* is used both for the recipient sense of 'to' and for the benefactive sense of English 'for', thus:

- (16) a. dan asa *le* rina bet bubot mi ec
 Dan made to (=for) Rina doll-house from wood
 b. rina timca *li* et ha séfer še ani carix
 Rina will-find to (=for) me OM the book that I need
 c. hu šaxax li knot *lanu* kartisim
 he forgot to buy to (=for) us tickets

However (and this is highly pertinent to our analysis of other uses of *le-* nominals in the same syntactic environment), benefactive *le-* differs

from the canonic 'to' or recipient datives of (15) in that it can be replaced by other prepositions with roughly the meaning of English 'for'—e.g. *le-má'an* 'for the sake of', *avur* and *bišvil* 'for'. This is shown in the examples in (17), where the glosses show that both *le-* and *bišvil* can yield either a benefactive or a "proxy" reading. Here, too, the linear ordering of postverb nominals is determined largely by factors of heaviness—so that *le-* marked pronouns tend to precede the direct object, whereas *bišvil* plus pronoun generally follows it.

- (17) a. dan kana *la-hem* kartisim *bišvil-i*
 Dan bought (to)them tickets for-me
 = (i) the tickets were intended for me
 OR (ii) Dan did the buying instead of me
- b. dan kana *li* kartisim *bišvil-am*
 Dan bought (to)me tickets for-them
 = (i) the tickets were intended for them
 OR (ii) Dan did the buying instead of them
- c. dan hexna *la-hem* et ha oto
 Dan parked to-them OM the car
 = dan hexna et ha oto *bišvil-am* } = 'Dan parked the(ir) car
 Dan parked OM the car for-them } for them'

These, then, are the canonic datives with *le-* marking the recipient, as in (15), or the benefactee, as in (16) and (17); and in the latter case, *le-* alternates quite freely with *bišvil*, the choice being determined by such factors as register, relative focus, and so on. This same construction in the form of $S \wedge V \wedge DO \wedge IO$ also occurs in what can be termed the "extended" dative, where *le-* is used to mark a wide range of semantic roles other than recipient or benefactee. The examples in (18) below illustrate such different uses of *le-* marking in three-place predicates. They are typical of current spoken Hebrew, although not attested to in earlier stages of the language, which is probably why they are viewed as nonnormative by some (Sivan 1976). It is feasible to relate them to the pervasive influence of Slavic-Yiddish on the Hebrew of some decades back (Even-Zohar, forthcoming).⁸

The most typical such extension of *le-* marking is in reference to the POSSESSOR nominal, as shown below:

8. Loan translations from these substrata abound in colloquial Hebrew expressions with a dative-marked nominal, e.g. *lo bo'er li (šum davar)* 'not burns to-me (nothing)' in the sense of 'I'm in no hurry'.

- (18) (i) a. *ima raxaca le dan et ha panim*
 Mom washed to Dan OM the face =washed Dan's face
 (for him)
 = b. *ima raxaca et ha panim šel dan*
 Mom washed OM the face of Dan =Dan's face
- (ii) a. *ani exboš lexa et ha yad*
 I'll bandage to-you OM the hand =I'll bandage your hand
 (for you)
 = b. *ani exboš et ha yad šel-xa*
 I'll bandage OM the hand of-you =your hand

It might be argued that the dative forms in the (a) sentences of (18) are used because Hebrew, like French and other unrelated languages, does not require possessive marking on body parts and other inalienably possessed objects which are understood to belong to a given participant in the discourse context. But this is, in fact, not necessarily the case, as shown by the following version of (18-ii), which is conceivable in a situation where one orderly makes an offer to another:

- (19) *ani exboš lexa et ha yad šel ha pacúa*
 I'll bandage to-you OM the hand of the wounded
 'I'll bandage the injured man's hand for you'

In addition, dative marking can be used for inalienable possession, as in:

- (20) (i) a. *ima kiftera le dan et ha sveder*
 Mom buttoned to Dan OM the sweater
 =b. *ima kiftera et ha sveder šel dan*
 Mom buttoned OM the sweater of Dan =Dan's sweater
- (ii) a. *lama atem melaxlexim li et ha šatí'ax?*
 why (are) you dirtying to-me OM the carpet?
 =b. *lama atem melaxlexim et ha šatí'ax šel-i?*
 why (are) you dirtying OM the carpet of-me =my carpet?

Again, the possessor reading is not necessary, although it is the one generally preferred.⁹ Thus, the direct object of (20-ii) could be *ha šatí'ax šel ha šxena* 'the carpet of the neighbor=the neighbor's carpet', analogous to the 'wounded man's hand' in (19). And the example in (20-i) about the

9. It seems clear that the possessor interpretation is the most basic extension of dative *le-* in such constructions. Thus, whenever native Hebrew speakers were asked for examples, they would come up with expressions such as *nšbera lo ha yad* 'broke to-him the hand' in the sense of 'he broke his hand/arm'. Moreover, in written tests requiring informants to paraphrase a wide variety of three-place predicate sentences with *le-* marked NPs, Ben David (1975) found that the possessor response was by far the most frequent.

mother's buttoning the child's sweater is possible with dative marking on 'the child' just in case he is actually wearing the sweater at the time, whereas no such implication holds where the more neutral possessive marker is used to yield 'Dan's sweater' in (20-ib); the latter could be used had the mother been buttoning the child's sweater before putting it into the drawer, say. That is, the use of *le-* dative marking in the above examples conveys a distinct sense of the person thus referred to—the child Dan having his sweater buttoned, or the speaker having the carpet dirtied—as being intimately involved in and directly AFFECTED by the event described.

In general, in current Hebrew, *le-* marking can be extended to all kinds of oblique object arguments, just in case they may be perceived as affected—either favorably or adversely—by the event in question. These various possibilities are illustrated in (21) below, set out according to the nature of the affectedness, as demonstrated by the periphrastic case marking preposition in the (b) sentences.

- (21) (i) POSSESSOR: a. ha tinok lixlex *li* et ha xulca
 the baby dirtied to-me OM the shirt
 =b. ha tinok lixlex et ha xulca *šel-i*
 the baby dirtied OM the shirt of-me =my shirt
- (ii) BENEFACTEE: a. dan hizmin *la-nu* mekomot
 Dan ordered for-us seats
 =b. dan hizmin mekomot *bišvil-enu*
 Dan ordered seats for us
- (iii) DEPRIVEE: a. hu ganav/lakax *le* rina harbe ra'ayonot
 he stole/took to Rina many ideas
 =b. hu ganav/lakax harbe ra'ayonot *mi* rina
 he stole/took many ideas from Rina
- (iv) LOCATEE: a. ha axot sama *lo* talk
 the nurse put to-him powder
 b. ha axot sama *al-av* talk
 the nurse put on-him powder

Semantically, what all the above have in common is the fact that the dative-marked nominal is presented as the individual(s) affected by the situation. Thus, in (21-i), the wearer/owner of the shirt is affected by its being dirtied; in (21-ii), the benefactee/recipient of the tickets were favorably affected by what the agent did; in (21-iii), the deprivee of such activities as stealing or taking could also be specified by the more normative, ablative marker *mi-* 'from'. Moreover, this case marker is obligatory in cases where the nominal in question cannot be viewed as affected or as personally "deprived" of something, thus:

- (22) a. *hu ganav harbe ra'ayonot *la* ma'amar šela
 he stole many ideas to her article
 b. hu ganav harbe ra'ayonot *me* ha ma'amar šela
 he stole many ideas from her article

This accords well with the general requirement that canonic datives be human, or at least animate. (Compare English "she brought flowers to her friend," which allows dative shifting, with "she brought flowers to her party," which does not.) Note, further, that the dual nature of the effect, whether benefactive or malefactive (so that the affectee is either beneficiary or victim), does not necessarily depend on the semantics of the verb alone, although, clearly, stealing generally affects the deprivee adversely, and putting tends to relate to location. There are, however, cases in which a given activity is semantically neutral, but it may be perceived as either positive or negative in effect for extralinguistic, pragmatic reasons, as in the following:

- (23) hu patax *li* et ha délet/ ha tik
 he opened to-me OM the door/ the file

This could mean either that he was kind enough to open the door *for* me, or let me see the file, or that he did me a disservice by opening the door (or, say, a police record) *against* me, as it were. This potential ambiguity would not, of course, occur in languages (such as the Quechua-Mayan language of Aymara, Dan Slobin, personal communication) which have a special case-marking particle to indicate the malefactivee.

Some such constructions are semantically ambiguous, too, quite apart from how the person in question views himself as subjectively affected. For instance, the sentence in (24) was given three variant paraphrases by subjects asked to interpret it in isolation (Ben David, 1975). The responses are translated below into English, listed in decreasing order of frequency.

- (24) lakáx-ti *lo* et ha séfer ba-sifriya
 I-took to-him OM the book in-the library
 =a. I took the book FROM him (when in the library)
 b. I took the book FOR him (from the library)
 c. I took the book OF him = his book (in/from the library)

The sentences in (18) through (24) of this section—which we have termed "extended" datives—all share a semantic property which links them to the "ethical" datives discussed in Section 1 above: they represent several different relationships—as evidenced by the distinct paraphrases to which they lend themselves—that have in common the sense of association or involvement of someone with an event for which he is not re-

sponsible, and of which he is not the direct patient, an event by which he is nonetheless affected, either favorably or adversely. In these "extended" datives, then, *le-* marking serves to set up a tripartite relationship between the agent of the event, the thing to which something is done, and the individual(s) affected by the fact that something has happened.

In syntactic terms, the third, nondirect object argument in such three-place predicate constructions represents a single grammatical relation, which we choose to term INDIRECT OBJECT. Following the general lines of the NP accessibility hierarchy as established originally by Keenan & Comrie (1977), we wish to claim the following: Hebrew has an object relation for nominals which function in two-place predicate constructions, and which semantically has the role of patient in most instances. This object relation is of two syntactic kinds: direct or accusative objects taking the special marker *et* when definite; and "governed" objects following verbs which lexically govern a particular preposition, corresponding to, for example, English *handle* vs. *deal with*, *discuss* vs. *talk about*, *affect* vs. *impinge on*, *cause* vs. *lead to*. These two object types are semantically alike, but they have very different syntactic consequences (Berman 1978, pp. 127–138). Secondly, Hebrew has a class of indirect objects which occur in three-place predicates AND which take dative-marking with *le-*. In the case of true or canonic datives, those having a semantic recipient interpretation, and in their case alone, the *le-* dative marker is, firstly, governed by the verb and, secondly, it thus cannot be replaced by some other preposition in paraphrase relation to it. In all other cases, the *le-* marked NP is not governed by the verb, and it can be replaced by another case-marking preposition—indicating source, deprivee, location, etc. Syntactically, there is no motivation for distinguishing these from one another, or from other OBLIQUE OBJECTS, such as instrumentals or comitatives.¹⁰ They all occur as the quite generally OPTIONAL third argument, fleshing out a basic SVO construction (in which, as noted, the O may be either accusative or "governed"); they behave identically with respect to syntactic processes such as interrogative, passive, relativization, and left-dislocation; and they are

10. Both traditional and more contemporary Hebrew grammars display confusion in their use of the term *musa akif* 'indirect (or oblique) object' by contrast with *musa yašir* 'direct object'. The latter term is reserved for all and only objects which take the accusative marker *et* when definite, while the term 'indirect' or 'oblique' is used as a dumping-ground for all the rest. Various characterizations of these terms in more recent Hebrew studies are reviewed in Berman (1982), as background to the analysis of various kinds of oblique and adverbial nominals in Hebrew. In Berman (1978) I try to specify which features of "direct objects" set them apart from other, semantically similar types of object constructions in the language.

subject to similar constraints on linear ordering with respect to the main verb in terms of degree of "individuation" (Hopper & Thompson 1980), on the one hand, and prosodic features of heaviness, on the other. Moreover, they are high on the continuum of "bitransitivity" ranging from IOs and other obliques at the one end via Locationals to other Adverbials at the other (Berman 1982).

In other words, the expressions considered here under the label of "extended" datives are semantically members of a single class of Affectee, while syntactically they form a coherent class of Indirect Objects in modern Hebrew.¹¹ Moreover, while highly productive and very typical of everyday usage, from early childhood on (Berman, *in press*), they are a relatively recent phenomenon in the language; and in this they contrast with the last set of constructions to be considered, the reflexive datives which, as noted earlier, are attested to in biblical Hebrew.

4. Reflexive or Coreferential Datives

This heading refers to constructions which differ from those considered in Sections 1 to 3 above, in that the *le-* marked nominal must be coreferential with the subject of the sentence, and hence it must be pronominal. This type of construction was illustrated at the outset of our paper by reference to example (2c), which is repeated here.

- (25) dan_i ne'elam lo_i pit'om me ha ófek
 Dan disappeared to-him(self) suddenly from the horizon
 'Dan's gone and suddenly disappeared from the scene'

Such coreferential datives cannot be given an exclusively "affectee" interpretation, since they may refer to the volitional agent of an action, as in:

- (26) ha yeladim histalku la-hem
 the children ran-away to-them(selves)
 'The kids (upped and) ran away'

They also differ stylistically from the *le-* marked constructions discussed in preceding sections, since they have their origins in biblical Hebrew, and they occur quite freely in literary prose today.

11. Faltz (1978) objects to the claim of universality for IO as a syntactic category, as suggested by the Keenan & Comrie (1977) hierarchy. Semantically, "obliques" such as instrumentals or locatives can be shown to differ from IOs, whether dative marked or not, for the latter are typically both definite and animate, manifesting the "high individuation" properties associated with datives in general (Hopper & Thompson, 1980; and see details for Hebrew in Berman, 1982). Compelling arguments along these lines are provided, for instance, by Ziv & Sheintuch (1979).

As background, note that preferred Hebrew style generally does not require an explicitly reflexive form of pronouns coreferential with subject NPs in the same clause, as is shown by the ambiguity of the following sentences (as well as (2a) vs. (2c) above).

- (27) (i) *dan kana lo ofanáyim*
 Dan bought to-him a bike
 =a. *dan kana li vno ofanáyim*
 Dan bought for his son a bike
 OR b. *dan kana le acmo ofanáyim*
 Dan bought for himself a bike
- (ii) *ha dayarim mac'u la-hem dira basof*
 the tenants found for-them a house eventually
 =a. *ha dayarim mac'u la orxim dira basof*
 the tenants found (for) the guests a house eventually
 OR b. *ha dayarim mac'u le acmam dira basof*
 the tenants found for themselves a house eventually

This use of the ordinary personal pronoun in the dative, rather than an explicitly and unambiguously coreferential reflexive pronoun reflects biblical usage, a reflexive paradigm based on the stem *'ecem* 'essence, bone, thing' having come into use in later, mishnaic Hebrew. (For contrastive examples from the two stages of the language, see Bendavid 1971, p. 880.)

There is no straightforward semantic distinction between the personal/reflexive pronoun forms of the sentences in (27), although nonreflexives are perhaps preferred in literary style, as being more "classical." Where both options exist in everyday usage, choice of one over the other reflects the way in which the participants are perceived in relation to the event in question: the simple pronoun is used when the patient is viewed as an intimate part of the event, one and the same person being both the perpetrator and the experiencer of the event in question, and the patient is intrinsic to the event, rather than merely the object thereof. The overt reflexive pronoun, by contrast, treats the patient as lying outside the event, as an object external to the activity, which happens to be perpetrated both by and for the same person—and the fact that the agent and the experiencer are the same individual(s) is incidental rather than intrinsic to the event. That is, we are claiming that the Hebrew version of, say, 'Dan bought himself + Refl a bike' is closer in perspective to, say, 'Dan bought *his wife* a bike' than it is to the coreferential reading of 'Dan_i bought him_i a bike'. This reflects the fact that the dative nominal of the latter sentence—*dan_i kana lo_i ofanáyim*—has the same argument structure as does the straightforward SVO *dan kana ofanáyim* 'Dan bought (a) bike'. That is, the dative

Interestingly enough, a coreferential reading on nonreflexive pronouns within a single clause is possible today—by contrast with biblical Hebrew—just in case the pronoun carries *le-*, but no other case marking. Thus, the following can only be interpreted as noncoreferential with simple pronouns, and as coreferential with reflexive pronouns respectively.

- (28)
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|--------|------------|-----------------|-------|------|--------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| a. | dan | makir | <i>oto</i> | me | cuyan | ≠ | dan | makir | <i>et</i> | <i>acmo</i> |
| | Dan | knows | | him | well | | Dan | knows | OM | himself |
| | | | | | | | | | me | cuyan |
| | | | | | | | | | | well |
| b. | rina | tamid | batxa | <i>ba</i> | ≠ | rina | tamid | batxa | | |
| | Rina | always | trusted | in-her | | Rina | always | trusted | | |
| | | | | | | | | <i>be</i> | <i>acma</i> | |
| | | | | | | | | in | herself | |
| c. | ha | pkidim | somxim | <i>al-eyhem</i> | ≠ | ha | pkidim | somxim | | |
| | the | clerks | rely | on them | | the | clerks | rely | | |
| | | | | | | | | <i>al</i> | <i>acmam</i> | |
| | | | | | | | | on | themselves | |

(29) a. go to-you = 'get thee away' : לך לך
 b. pass over to-you = 'pass ye over' : עברו לכם
 c. rise to-you + Fem = 'get thee up' : קומי לך

(i) dan hitkasa dan hitgalé'ax
 Dan covered (himself) up Dan shaved (himself)

(ii) dan kisa et acmo/ bno
 Dan covered OM himself/ his son
 dan gil'é'ax et acmo/ et raglav
 Dan shaved OM himself/ OM his legs

Gesenius notes that this dative is used “especially in colloquial language and later style in the form of a pronoun with *le-* as an apparently pleonastic *dativus ethicus* with many verbs in order to give emphasis to the significance of the occurrence in question FOR a particular subject” (emphasis mine), hence explicitly relating it to our presently relevant notion of benefactee or affectee. Gesenius then goes on to say that “in this construction, the person of this pronoun must always agree with that of the verbal form (i.e. with the subject of a person-marked verb—R.B.). By far the most frequent use of this *le-* is with the pronoun of the second person after an imperative” (1910, p. 381).

As a footnote to his observation that the dative-marked pronoun and the verb-incorporated subject must agree—that is, be coreferential—Gesenius notes that “such expressions as the analogous English *he plucked me ope his doublet, but me no buts* and the like are, accordingly inadmissible in Hebrew.” Yet precisely these cases from English, which are stilted and archaic-sounding today (the first edition of Gesenius’ grammar was in 1813!), correspond to the “extended” and “ethical” datives considered thus far by us; and their equivalents in Hebrew, with dative-marked indirect objects, sound perfectly natural today.

One further historical comment is that in biblical Hebrew, use of reflexive *le-* was very common, but almost totally restricted to second person imperatives like those in (29) above. However, modern Hebrew has extended this use to a wide variety of nonimperative contexts, as illustrated below:

- (30) a. rina yašva (*la*) ba pina ve baxta
 Rina_i sat (to her) in-the corner and wept
 ‘Rina was sitting herself/was sitting in the corner and crying’
 b. lama ata rac (*le-xa*) kaxa ba rexov?
 why (are) you running to-you so in-the street?
 ‘Why are you running that way in the street?’
 c. ani stam sixák-ti (*li*) šam
 I just played (to-me) there
 ‘I was just playing away there/just having myself a game’
 d. dan mitnapé’ax (*lo*) mi yom le yom
 Dan_i swells-up (to him_i) from day to day
 ‘Dan’s getting (himself) fatter/more swollen-headed by the day’
 e. he inyanim yistadru (*la-hem*) be mēšex ha zman
 the matters will-settle (to-them) in course the time
 ‘Things will settle (themselves) down in due course’

In such sentences, the dative pronoun does not introduce any other argument or specify any additional role, so that it is very different from

the "ethical" datives of Section 1, which serve precisely to encode some extraneous nonparticipant as involved in the event. The dative pronouns in (30) are repetitive of the subject, hence semantically redundant ("pleonastic" in Gesenius' terms) in not adding any new role to the description, and—as the parentheses indicate—they are syntactically unnecessary for producing well-formed utterances. The verbs are typically, though not necessarily, intransitive in such constructions,¹³ and the subject of the sentence need not be animate, as shown by (30-e).

It is not easy to provide a uniform account of this use of dative marking, for it varies according to the verbs with which it is associated, as well as the flavor which the speaker chooses to attach to his utterance by this extra marking on the action or perpetrator of the action;¹⁴ and this is shown by the rather awkward free translations supplied for each sentence in (30).

The main effect of use of the reflexive dative seems to be precisely one of assigning REFLEXIVITY to the event, in that the event is viewed as reflecting forward from the subject to the dative pronoun and backward from the dative pronoun to the subject. Thus, the use of *le-* highlights the AUTONOMY of the event, as perpetrated to, by, and for the subject noun (even where the subject is nonanimate, as in (30-e), the affairs in question

13. Transitive verbs can be used in this construction—as in formulaic *da lexa* 'know to-you' in the imperative sense of 'get it into your head'. But then an "extended" dative interpretation will more generally be yielded, e.g.

- (i) *šavár-ti li et ha kad*
I broke to-me OM the vase = 'I went and broke my vase'

or in other cases the dative will be used as a stylistic alternant of a reflexive pronoun, e.g.

- (ii) *ata xayav le sader le-xa / le-acmexa et ha inyanim*
you have to arrange to-you / to-yourself OM the things
'You must arrange things for yourself/see to your own affairs'

14. One appealing possibility would be if dative marking were restricted to nonpunctive verbs, so that it could be used only in a durative sense—corresponding to the contrastive use of *se* in Spanish in describing durative but not punctive action (Hopper & Thompson 1980). However, although dative reflexives in Hebrew do typically imply some kind of durative process—as in all the examples in (30) of the text—they can also be used with punctive actions, as in (ii) below.

- (i) *dan yašan lo kol ha láyla bli be'ayot*
Dan slept to-him all the night without problems
'Dan had no trouble in sleeping all night long'
- (ii) *dan nirdam lo žik žak*
Dan fell asleep to him(self) in a jiffy
'Dan dropped off to sleep in a jiffy'

are characterized as getting into shape of their own accord, without anyone's intervention as an outside agent). That is, these reflexives refer to processes which are carried out by the subject NP with a high degree of independence, the subject's own involvement in the process being sharply marked through the dative-reflexive pronoun. Hence, not only is there no outside agent in such situations, but the event is intrinsically tied to the subject noun as its patient/doer *and* as its experiencer/affectee, as the person or thing most intimately and exclusively affected by the process. Hence this coreferential use of *le-* serves to combine the role and nature of reflexivized objects (Faltz 1977) on the one hand, and of marking the affectee role through use of the dative on the other.

5. Discussion

We have tried to show that the dative preposition *le-* in modern Hebrew can be used to refer to noun phrases which semantically cover the entire spread from the most extraneous "onlooker" type of the *dativus ethicus* of Section 1 through the most internal, subject-identical type of the *dativus commodi* of Section 4. Thus, the various syntactic constructions in which *le-* occurs can be charted along a cline of "degree of affectee participation," where at one extreme the reflexive dative pronoun refers to the only direct participant in an event (Section 4), and at the other extreme, the dative nominal refers to an outsider, a nonparticipant who is nevertheless affected by the event.

In its most central sense, the *le-* marks the affectee of the event, and as such: (a) it allows reference to someone outside the event, as in the ethical datives of Section 1; (b) it allows the language to encode the experiencer/affectee rather than the agent, hence further draining the already relatively weak status of the subject relation in Hebrew, as discussed in Section 2 (and see Berman 1980); (c) it makes it possible to extend the canonic dative roles of recipient/benefactee to possessors, deprivées, and locatees by means of the "extended" datives of Section 3, providing a uniform marking of different case roles all sharing the semantic function of AFFECTEE and allowing for a coherent characterization of the relation of Indirect Object in modern Hebrew; and (d) it makes it possible for speakers to mark the aspectual nature of certain activities by extending the classical reflexive dative to a wide range of predications, as shown in Section 4.

Finally, one can consider certain more general implications of our analysis of dative marking as based on modern Hebrew. It might be worthwhile

investigating how these uses of *le-* relate to the fact that the same morpheme also marks not only possessive relations in conjunction with the verb 'be', but also direction towards as in *dan nasa le tel aviv* 'Dan traveled to Tel Aviv' as well as the infinitive form of verbs, as in *dan raca le-daber* 'Dan wanted to talk'. For this is a combination of one form to many functions which Hebrew shares with such unrelated languages as English on the one hand, and Bantu languages like Kinyarwanda and Swahili on the other.

It also seems worth considering typological properties of languages in terms of their "dative orientation," to ascertain how their propensity for or against dative constructions correlates with other of their properties. For instance, languages like Hebrew, Russian, and Kannada, which use dative marking for possession, might be more strongly inclined to extensive use of datives than a language like French, which has both a *habere* verb and a dative or genitive marking of possessors. On the other hand, French might be more receptive to dative marking than, for example, is English, which today manifests LOSS of earlier, dative-marked predicates such as the verbs meaning *like* or *please, repent, think, seem, ail, matter, belong*, etc. which existed as such through to middle English (Lightfoot 1979, pp. 229-239). In this, English can be associated with the class of languages which manifest a dative-to-nominative shift diachronically, as discussed in Cole *et al.* (1980), quite the reverse of what we have observed for Hebrew. Besides, English has a partially productive mechanism for promoting indirect objects in such a way that they lose their dative properties by means of so-called "dative shifting."

Cross-linguistically, languages differ in the extent to which they allow, or require, dative marking on experiential predicates of the type discussed in Section 2. Thus, for instance, Dravidian languages, as discussed by Sridhar (1976), use dative marking across a wide range of two-argument "dative subject constructions;" and they often have no alternative way of marking experiencers or recipients. Hebrew has alternatives in many cases: ordinary SVO nominatives in place of experiential datives; other case markers in the extended three-place datives; and ordinary reflexive pronouns with transitive verbs. Yet the very existence of a dative option in Hebrew today tends to drain these periphrastic alternatives of much of their force in actual usage. It appears that French has more numerous, and more highly grammaticized, types of alternative formulations than does Hebrew, so that French might be still lower on the scale of dative orientation than current Hebrew, though higher than is English.

The question also arises which datives are more basic or primary than others, where this is meant in a typological rather than a derivational

sense. This would make it possible to stipulate, given that a language has one kind of dative, whether the existence of other kinds might also be predicted for it, synchronically as well as in the course of time. Historically, the reflexive datives perpetuate but also greatly extend a form found in biblical usage (said by Gesenius, as noted, to occur "especially in later language and colloquial style"). But impersonal experientials similar to modern *yadu'a lo* 'is-known to-him'='he knows' and *na'im lanu* 'is-pleasant to-us'='we like' such as have been lost in English, are also attested to in classical Hebrew. We suggested that the most semantically extreme case of the "ethical" dative might perhaps be the prototypical instance, hence more basic than all the others. Yet evidence from numerous unrelated languages suggests that perhaps the impersonal experientials (as discussed in our Section 2) are the primary type of datives and that only if a language has them will it also have, e.g., ethical and extended, possibly reflexive, datives as well. Moreover, the evidence from English suggests that, in a highly nondative-oriented language, canonic datives marking the recipient in three-place predicates may be retained almost in isolation. Ideally, both an intralanguage and cross-language hierarchy might be established to provide a diachronic and synchronic base for explaining and predicting how and why languages use the dative across historical stages and within language types.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bendavid, Abba. 1971. *Ləšon miqra' uləšon ḥakamim*. Tel Aviv.
- Ben David, T. 1975. "A consideration of prepositional phrases with *le-* and reflexive sentences with the preposition *le-*." Tel Aviv University, ms. (In Hebrew).
- Berman, R. 1978. *Modern Hebrew Structure*. Tel Aviv.
- _____. 1979a. "Lexical decomposition and lexical unity in the expression of derived verbal categories in Modern Hebrew." *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 6 (3):1-26.
- _____. 1979b. "Form and function: Passives, middles, and impersonals in Modern Hebrew." *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 5:1-29.
- _____. 1980. "The case of an (S)VO language: Subjectless constructions in Modern Hebrew." *Language* 56: 759-776.
- _____. 1982. "On the nature of 'oblique' in bitransitive constructions." *Lingua* 56:387-411.
- _____. in press. "Acquisition of Hebrew." In D. I. Slobin (ed.), *Cross-Linguistic Study of Child Language*. Hillsdale.

- Bolinger, D. 1973. "Ambient 'it' is meaningful too." *Journal of Linguistics* 9:261-270.
- Cole, P., W. Harbert, G. Hermon and S. N. Sridhar, 1980. "On the acquisition of subjecthood." *Language* 56:1-63.
- Even-Zohar, I. forthcoming. "The dialogues of Gnessin and the question of Russian models." In D. Miron & D. Laor (eds.), *Uri Nissan Gnessin: Research and Documents*. Jerusalem. (In Hebrew).
- Faltz, L. 1977. Reflexivization: A study in universal syntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- . 1978. "On indirect objects in universal syntax." *Chicago Linguistic Society* 14:76-87.
- Gesenius, 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. by E. Kautsch, rev. by A. E. Cowley (2nd English edition). Oxford.
- Gil, D. Ms. "Case-marking, phonological size, and linear order: Hebrew *et*."
- Hopper, P. & S. A. Thompson, 1980. "Transitivity in grammar and discourse." *Language* 56:251-299.
- Keenan, E. 1976. "Towards a universal definition of subject." In C. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York.
- Keenan, E. & B. Comrie, 1977. "Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Leclère, C. 1975. "Datifs syntaxiques et datif éthique." *Rapport de Recherches*, Laboratoire d'Automatique Documentaire et Linguistique 5, Université de Paris.
- Lightfoot, D. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. London.
- Sivan, R. 1976. "The flooding of *le-*." Paper presented at 3rd Annual Conference, Israel Association of Applied Linguistics, Tel Aviv, July 1976.
- Sridhar, S. N. 1976. "Dative subjects, rule government, and relational grammar." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 6(1):130-151.
- Ziv, Y. 1976. "On the reanalysis of grammatical terms in Hebrew possessive constructions." In P. Cole (ed.), *Studies in Modern Hebrew Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 129-152. Amsterdam.
- Ziv, Y. & G. Sheintuch, 1979. "Indirect objects reconsidered." *Chicago Linguistic Society* 15:390-403.